Chief of Naval Operations
Adm. Jonathan Greenert

Sea Air Space- Lunch

8 April 2013

Admiral Greenert: You're probably wondering, what's that about? I have this phobia that all the applause will stop and I'll still be walking. Then I'll trip and fall, and then you'll clap again.

It's an honor and a privilege to be here. This is the time of the year. It's wonderful peace knowing that springtime is here. The Master is right around the corner. The Nationals have started. The orioles have started up again. March Madness has started. We've been sequestered and testimony is just around the corner. What could be better? We're looking great.

As I spoke to those over there at this morning's session, we're in an interesting time now. We have received our, if you will, the budget for '13 has been sort of straightened out. We've got a continuing resolution for the rest of the year. We have a bill. The bill gets us some money. Gets us moving along. And up until now, I'll tell you, if you want to talk about the dark ages, we've been in like a fog bank, just moving from one place to the other has taken an all-hands effort. The comptrollers are moving the world as we go from one to the other figuring out where are we going to spend the precious money that we have? How do we make sure we get through the year?

So now we've got this injection of money. Operating money. We've got a way ahead. We've got some pretty good items in investment in this building and we feel much better. We can get our reimbursements done, pay the must-pay bills, get the FY13 global force management distribution on its way, talk to the combatant commanders. We've done that. I think we have a way ahead. Get the training going, get the maintenance going to prepare for the '14 deployments. Again, that plan. We have to sit down and talk about that plan and say well, we've going into '14 different than we originally planned. Is this the global force management allocation plan I want to carry ahead? We're having that conversation.

We're doing some shore readiness and some support items that are very important that we have to get done. But we're not doing all of it. So there's clearly a shortfall as we finish. We have a $4 billion shortfall and about a $44 billion budget in operation going into '14. So stuff's missing. That's because we got sequestered. We have a requisite investment issue there that we'll have to take care of. More on that later as we go on ahead.

This morning I mentioned, what are we looking at out into the future? I want to talk a little bit about that. What are the things we're moving ahead with?

The undersea domain, for sure. I've got the Strategic Studies Group Working on that up in Newport. What are the important features that dominate the undersea domain? That's something we need to do. That's on us. The Navy is unique.

Talking about the [RD]. We've talked to the Coast Guard, Canadian Navy, the north -- the NATO nations, that is the far north guys. We talked about what do we want to do, how do we prepare our system to do that? That's important.

Working together with the Marine Corps as they come back to sea. What makes sense as we build our ships of the future? That's important.

I want to mention today an item, and then I'll take your questions, and that's the electromagnetic spectrum. Just before I took over as CNO I go down to a meeting as the Vice Chief and the topic was how do we sell off or how do we give up this sliver of frequency in the electromagnetic spectrum? That is a DoD frequency, DoD issued that from the Federal Communications Commission, and they wanted it back. They wanted to sell it. They wanted to sell it for broadband and other things. We had very important systems on it and we said we can't do this. They said do you have any idea how much money this is? So we had to broker this and we had to compromise.

So in my little head I said this is a losing proposition, ladies and gentlemen. We are stuck in areas of the electromagnetic spectrum, which I don't know a heck of a lot about, but I can kind of see the writing on the wall here, so I went back and I got, who else? The Strategic Studies Group. They said hey, next week we need a topic. I said the electromagnetic spectrum. I want you to go out and figure out how to get me out of it, or get me out of where I am.

So they came back to me a year later and they said you know, it's amazing where we are in this thing. This thing is really important.

Put up the first slide.

I said it is. You can see here. Our command ship, the Blue Ridge. It's better off commanding the fleet because it's in that spectrum hundreds of miles away. If we had a crisis in Korea we wouldn't send a ship out there. Having been on it, and actually because of the satellite angles and everything else, it does better further away. That's the E2Z. That is Navy, the integrated fire control system that we have in the future is all about using the electromagnetic spectrum. Never -- You've seen the lower right. That's UCAS. He's going to go up here in the very near future, unmanned from the carrier. Cutting edge stuff. The electromagnetic spectrum. It is just soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, coast guardsmen. We're all over that thing. It's so important today.

So what do we know about it?

Next one, please.

Well, not as much as we should. We've been in this situation before where we've just dominated some of the things that are going well and all of a sudden we figure out hey, everybody else is studying the phenomenon. So why do I got a submarine? You go back to the Cold War and there was a time our submarines were so quiet we just drove around saying ah,

we'll hear everybody. At least we thought we were so quiet. The other side was so noisy, and we always heard them before they heard us. Then somebody started selling away stuff, so our acoustics signature started actually becoming a liability.

What did we do? Well, we got our acoustic hygiene right. We started tracking all the frequencies, all the noise levels, and we started ratcheting back on that so that again, our signature, we had control of it. We measured everything by what frequency we put in the water. We got much smarter on it.

So this is a challenge that we've had before and that we've overcome before. If you look at this class of submarine, what makes it great is control of its signature. Major control of its signature.

Go to the next picture, please.

So years and year ago, the Cold War, we actually had our mission control down pat. That's a picture of the America in a fjord, way back in the '70s, early '80s, where we snuck this thing up under [MCON] and parked her up there. We measured very closely if anybody knew that ship was being followed of [inaudible], if anybody could track this thing, and we found that they couldn't. We were pretty good at [MCON] and we've gone away from it. Now we need to get back.

So recently we took the Nimitz and we said okay, we're going to, in an exercise called Valiant Shield. We said we want you to turn all of your [EN] stuff off. So they said, in [inaudible] condition and whatever. It took over an hour to get everything turned off. You turn the big stuff off, and it starts coming down, and somebody's going what the hell is that? Somebody turn that off. What is that? It's anything from WiFis to computers to you name it that we're pulling out there.

So we worked at it and they got it down to about three minutes. So this idea of [MCON] is something in the important subject of controlling our missions and knowing what we're doing and why we're doing it. It's important, but it's something we've seen before and we can do and we can control it. You've got to know your environment.

Next slide.

You've got to be agile. We figured that. We are [inaudible]. This is just a list of the antenna on an island. It's a lot. That's the point. A lot of antenna. Antenna or hard wired. We don't do frequency [inaudible]. We're spewing stuff out, and it's how do you control all this with your system?

So we've got to move ahead and we're doing it.

Next one.

The JFK, the next carrier, and as we look at some of our future combat systems and really, we can back-fit to put antenna out there that have aperture control. You can change it. You can

change the frequency. Change what you put into the antenna in order to do that. So there's a way ahead for this and we're on track with that.

Next slide.

But you've got to change the mindset. The kids have got to understand the significance of it because we haven't really looked at this for well, generations. So many of them sort of understand it. If they're a cyber warrior they get it big time. But the day-to-day people out at sea, we really haven't laid that out for them. They don't understand the idea of real EM hygiene. They know cyber hygiene now. They know how to put a thumb drive in, at least many of them do, and insert their own virus. But similarly, we've got to understand you don't just turn stuff on. You just don't start radiating, rotating and radiating.

When I get the intel summaries today and they find out somebody's got a new whatever, by far what our potential adversaries are bringing in, more than anything else, is some [inaudible] finds and tracks a radar or something that provides a seeker, is a seeker that is outside our frequency band, low probability of intercept, something that we just [inaudible], we don't have there.

It's not a new boom as much. It's in a whole new realm. That's kind of where a lot of our potential adversaries are going.

You go to school today. If you're going to study Tomahawk Land Attack Missiles, you're going to employ it on a ship. Forty weeks. Today if you go to school, we send our kids to school, and you're going to look at what's called a SLQ-32 which is our electronic warfare main piece of gear, to a two week school. So we've got to get kind of the mindset changed out there and see what we think about it.

We have out there, as we go out and look at our crews, we have mission essential task lists on electronic warfare. We just haven't turned up the standards and we haven't said hey, we've got to get serious about this. That's how we certify our folks. Everything has to do with mission essential task list. That's what [inaudible] forces does.

Next one, please.

Look out, when you think about the effects we want to put out there, you've got to detect what's coming in at you, whether that be radar, whether it be a seeker from a missile, something kinetic. But you also have to decide what are the effects that I want out there. I'm telling you, non-kinetic is much much more a thing of our future. To get a good non-kinetic system you've got to understand the electromagnetic spectrum. If you understand the electromagnetic spectrum, then you can control it. You control your own emissions. You control a lot of the future of warfare.

So this is the Navy Laser Weapon System. Some of you are thinking, hey, they've got an observatory on a ship. No. It's not. That's not what it is. it's not a telescope. But this is, it works. I've got a little video here I want to show you. It's kind of amazing. Check it out.

This is that system, the Laser Weapon System being employed on the Dewey last July. Just watch it.

[Video shown].

This cost about $1 for this shot.

So you build the system, it costs a buck a shot. It's actually less than that, I'm doing it in round numbers. A five inch 54 shell costs about $5,000; a Tomahawk costs about $1.3 million; an SM6 costs about $5 million; and an SM3 Block 2B, the ultimate that's going to do missile defense, right now it costs about $20 million. So you can see this.

This is not a missile defense caliber laser, but my point in all this is non-kinetic, electromagnetic spectrum, understanding weapon systems, all connected is one of the things we've got to look after.

That system was demonstrated in the Dewey. That system is going on the Conte, our Afloat Forward Staging Base about a year from now.

Voice: Less than a year.

Admiral Greenert: You heard it here today. Less than a year. So you get the point.

What I'd pass to you today is, this is an important feature. It's in progress. There are some tangible aspects. It's about the culture, training the kids. It's something we've done before. We've got to control our own emissions, take non-kinetic stuff like that to sea and get with it and resonate.

Let me open the floor from questions. I'll take anything you guys want to talk about.

Question: -- centralized command and control, those higher authorities one more innovation, one more quick [inaudible].

Admiral Greenert: Well, what we're going to have to do is decide how much command and control do we really need. That's a very good point. We're addicted to follow the slides, follow the target information, we've got to [inaudible] targets still to get that done. But if you have, just like in the underwater domain where we had this kind of business, we still want to use active [stuff], there are periods where in your mission control communication plan or your strategic plan, you're going to have to decide when you open it and when you don't.

Question: Good afternoon. About two months ago you certainly made the news when you said we're not deploying the Truman, we're not going to go to the Caribbean, we're going to stop third and fourth quarter availability. I wonder if you can give us an update on that.

Admiral Greenert: Sure. I wish I controlled the deployment of the Truman. If I had that kind of power I would really be an amazing [inaudible]. What we did, the story of that is, as many of

you know we've been keeping 2-0 presence in the Arabian Gulf since about 2010. So whenever the Nimitz was due to be one of those candidates to go to the Gulf, she had a casualty so we had to shift things around. We came forward and said look, we propose in order to make this repair, that we go down to 1-0 in the Gulf, which was late last fall, and then we'll go to 2-0 by March. After looking at intelligence and a lot of other things they said that's the time we want to be there.

When the continuing resolution became clearly apparent in January, along with sequestration, we provided an option. We said look, we have enough money to send the Truman to the Gulf, but not enough money to send her to the Gulf and train the remainder of FY13 for those that would go to the Gulf next year. So you've got 2-0 through the year and then 0-0, if you will, or you can go 1-1 for the rest of this year, hold the Truman back here really for surge, for response, and then we put another -- We laid that out.

It was determined by DoD leadership that that was the right thing to do. They took it over to the White House and got concurrence, so that's what we went with.

As you well know, we've advertised under the continuing resolution and under sequestration, we had to go where the money was. The money is in a whole host of things. You saw it a lot there including some of our operations and some of our maintenance.

Now that we have a bill, as I said before, we will be going to restore the FY13 global force management application. Does that include the Truman? That can be a discussion. Right now she is held as the, if you will, a response carrier strike group. We're restoring the vast majority of the maintenance that we were planning to defer, we planned to restore, particularly in the order of, if you're a fiscal '13 deployer, '14 deployer or '15 deployer, we want to make sure that we get that maintenance done.

Air wings that we said were shut down, we're moving them up to what's called, to a level of flying that enables them to be safe, to be able to start training when the time comes and quickly ramp up. It's called tactical hard deck. That's a measure of how much you fly per month. We want to get all the air wings up to that level and then get the air wings ready to deploy in FY14.

So it's kind of like we took, we got a fiscal smoothie and we've got a 5 Hour Energy or something. We feel much better here for the rest of this year, but we don't have it all. But we're out of that really dormant kind of period that we had in January.

Question: A question related to this morning's review on the acquisition process. I'm just coming back from [inaudible] 20 years in the private sector. One of the things I noticed was acquisition reform in the 1990s resulted in a bifurcated chain of command. PEOs on one side, and [inaudible]. Is that being [inaudible]?

Admiral Greenert: It's not right now. My comment was this is an opportunity to make change. I think we would do well to do that.

We in the Navy have a good situation, and a lot of it is a matter of personality. I highly respect and enjoy working with Sean Stackley, the Navy's Acquisition Executive. We share things all the time. We meet at least quarterly with his PEOs. We come in for a two or three hour session, walk right down the major programs. So we share and we talk about requirements versus [inaudible]. But believe me, this is a very imperfect situation. You had it exactly right. There are two chains of command. How can we be sure that when I hand over the requirements document we agree to buy something and put that money in. If things change, and they always do, right? In the process. How does he get back to me and say hey look, if this is what you want here's the cost; and I can say let me change some requirements. Let me take it down to my chain of command, through that requirements process, and get this changed because that's too expensive, or I can't afford to wait for it to [inaudible]. We have to do much better than that.

I would like to, if we could, my nirvana would be that we could rewrite that process in order to bring those two together and require that exchange back and forth.

Now some would say well, that exists. It's in the RQB, the requirements resources whatever it is, the board that meets. I say yeah, but I don't think in many cases we have it at the right level. Or we're not sharing all the info. Or all the info is only available at that time. I think we have to have a much more coherent process.

Question: I was wondering if you can elaborate on the laser weapon [inaudible]. [Inaudible] and how laser weapons [inaudible].

Admiral Greenert: Right now we want to demonstrate it. But it could be, you see what it's suited to. It's a small [inaudible] or something like that. It might be a student to being able to address small boats, [inaudible], something of that nature. That's about the power level and its ability to hold that laser, if you will, on target, regenerate, and [inaudible]. When I move my hand like this, that's really a function of [inaudible].

The power level is such that it only addresses the kind of [crap] that we had there. The point is when you get to the point where you can again, hold and regenerate the laser, then you can move that mission set up to something larger and larger. At some day could it be missile defense? Perhaps. We're not there now.

But what I want to do is I want to get it out of the environment to which we want to one day deploy. You can see its potential, I think you can see that, and that's the key. Get it out in that ConOps and let those sailors, marines, coast guardsmen and civilian mariners sort through and say hey, this is what it takes to operate this. What does it really look like outside of the demo piece and outside of [inaudible]?

Question: I wanted to follow up on the acquisition process. I'm wondering if anybody is working with Congress specifically to address what you previous mentioned.

Admiral Greenert: Not to my knowledge.

Question: Would it be advisable?

Admiral Greenert: Well, I think it might be advisable. What we were speaking about this morning is, is this an opportunity, given that we're studying a lot of things in the Strategic Concept Management Group and DoD, and would this be something we need to take a look at. And within the Department of Defense it is something that Sean and I talk about. Perhaps the question you have to ask yourself is are you talking about slowly changing Goldwater/Nichols? Are you talking about Federal Acquisition Regulations? Internal regulations? We are looking, Mr. Stackley and I are looking in the Department of the Navy, how do we streamline the [trust]? Step one. Two, if we can't get it streamlined from a point where it can start moving and maybe release some of the requirements which enables you to limit your staff. We've got so many people assigned to this thing. Then you're looking at maybe a request, an initiative to change [inaudible].

Question: How's the [inaudible] organization working out for you? Has it worked well through this [inaudible]?

Admiral Greenert: I think it works pretty well, but when it's your baby you never look and say oh, this is really ugly. This is mine. But I've been very fortunate. We've been able to do, especially in constrained fiscal resources, have one individual, one entity accountable and responsible for the procurement, the modernization, the manning and the maintenance and the operations of platform [to] system. I think what you get here is a tradeoff. Somebody says I'll trade this for that in order to make it more affordable. Especially when it comes to maintenance, logistics, transportation, and operations.

The other side of that is when you're done with all that somebody, the manpower, the Chief of Naval Personnel has to say this would be an incoherent program across the spectrum. I don't have a nice lay-down , if you will, [inaudible], the NECs [inaudible].

So then you go back in, and the same can be said for maintenance and for operations. It has to be coherent. It has to be able to work within the system that we have. It may look good to the submariners or to an aviator or to the NECC folks. If it doesn't all fit together then we've got to go back and look at it.

I think what we find is we've gotten better ideas. We've gotten a better look at training. We've gotten a better look at manning. And maybe in some cases different ways to approach maintenance. So I like it. It causes good debate.

We have terrific first analogies in the OpNav arena, especially at the executive level. But I think that was important to get started.

Question: Over our history when we have been dominant in the warfare arena it's been largely because we've had innovative technology. Innovation is something that we're pretty good at. With Moore's Law it's no longer associated just with [inaudible]. Pretty much technology [inaudible] is advancing at a rate where [inaudible] 13 years to field a ground vehicle and stuff. The long term multi-year program of record used to work. It doesn't any more. From our standpoint out here, it's pretty innovation [inaudible].

That's understandable; it's a comfort zone issue. Program managers [inaudible] progress over years. And that results in [inaudible].

How do you do a culture change overnight? [Inaudible] ancient albatross, and I was [inaudible], we had race riots on aircraft carriers. The CNO came out and dictated that [FitReps] would include an item that governed that area of [inaudible]. Since everybody's career was based on these [FitReps], we had an overnight culture change. All of a sudden, [inaudible] race relations [inaudible] resonates [inaudible].

My suggestion would be that you might look at taking that approach. If you were to dictate that [FitReps] within the acquisition community be based on how to accept and manage risk, and the rate of incorporating innovation into programs of record on a continual basis. I think we might get a leg up on the [inaudible].

Admiral Greenert: Thank you for that. That's a very thoughtful piece of input. We'll take that. Thank you.

# # # #